

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/806,600	BOHNISCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dan Washburn	2628	

All Participants:

(1) Dan Washburn.

(2) Dan Radler.

Date of Interview: 5 June 2006

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 10 AM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none

Claims discussed:
claims 3 and 18


Prior art documents discussed:
none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 ULKA CHAUHAN
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Washburn and Mr. Radler discussed the similarities between claims 3 and 18, specifically that the only difference is the limitation, "to dynamically synchronize movement of the monitor with the image information displayed on the monitor". Mr. Radler noted that this added limitation limits the control unit described in claim 3 more than the control unit described in claim 18, which means the claims are different enough that they are not duplicates of each other.